REMARKS

This amendment is submitted in response to the Office Action dated September 7, 2006. Reconsideration and allowance of the claims is requested. In this Office Action, claims 13 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as lacking clarity. The necessary changes have been made to eliminate this issue.

Claims 1, 2, 6, 8, 9, 17, 18, 20 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as unpatentable over Wilen (US 6,724,389). Claims 3 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over Wilen in further view of Kobayashi (US 2004/0228365). Claims 4, 5, 7-9 and 11-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as unpatentable over Wilen in further view of Kruse (US 6,555,745). Claims 10 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as unpatentable over Wilen, in further view of Harari (US 6,893,268). These rejections are respectfully traversed. Claims 8-11, 16 are cancelled; new claims 22-26 are presented.

The art cited by the Examiner teaches, at most, a computing device that supports a graphics chip directly on the motherboard creating a fixed configuration which impedes the user's ability to upgrade the computing device's graphics system. Thus, the owner of the computing system is presented from taking advantage of improved graphics systems without purchasing an entirely new computing device.

Therefore, it is highly desirable to provide a field changeable system comprising an edge connector capable of supporting any one of a plurality of different field changeable cards, anyone of which may have a different type of graphics device mounted there on.

In the present invention, the edge connector is capable of detecting the presence of a graphics device which is mounted on the field changeable card and causing the system to adapt to the presence of the new graphics device. The claimed system further incorporates the edge connects' ability to detect and accept a loop-through card. When the loop-through card is present, LVDS signals may be appropriately routed through the card to appropriate output devices without the need to incorporate complex and costly additional LVDS capable devices into the system.

In a further embodiment, the graphics system can support DVI by detecting the presence of DVI signals on the connector ports and routing such signals through the loop-through card. All of these features, explained in detail at paragraphs [0027] – [0040] of the present application and now recited in the claims, increase the graphics and video flexibility of a system designed in accordance with the teachings of the present invention.

As against this, the Examiner primarily relies on the Abstract of Wilen, for the feature of detecting the presence of different cards, including a graphics rendering card or a loop-through card. But the language in the Abstract teaches only that the presence or absence of a card may be signaled. There are no specific teachings of making different types of cards available or of detecting a card with passive loop-through capabilities.

As further support for the rejection, the Examiner relies on Kruse. But Kruse teaches only a flexible interconnect, which is capable of connecting the outputs of a system to a display. There is no capability of detecting the presence of a particular kind of card, much less a loop-through card. In fact, Kruse at column 5, lines 46-52 clearly teaches that he is disclosing a complex, expensive flexible interconnect capable of being flexed into an S or similar configuration, rather than a loop-through card of the type which is clearly claimed herein.

The presence of a loop-through card in place of a graphics card is not taught or suggested in Wilen or Kruse. In fact, the Wilen reference (column 6, lines 42-60), clearly teaches that the add-detect signal is used to indicate that a card has been added, while disabling other systems such as the AGP interface. There is no teaching anywhere in the Wilen patent of the ability to distinguish between different graphics rendering cards and a loop-through card. In addition, there is no suggestion in Kruse that would cause a person of skill in the art to take the flexible cable disclosed in Kruse and plug it into the interface port of Wilen, as there would be no way for the Wilen system to detect the presence such an interconnect, much less utilize that cable in any of the ways disclosed and clearly claimed herein.

The references to Kobayashi and Harari have also been reviewed. They do not provide any teachings which make up for the deficiencies of the references discussed above. In view of these clear distinctions, reconsideration and allowance of the claims is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

James A. Sheridan
Registration No. 25,435
PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500
Houston, TX 77056
Telephone: (713) 623-4844
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846
Attorney for Applicants